

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-8 are currently pending. Claims 1-8 are rejected. Claims 1-4 have been amended.

II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a)

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Taguchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,160,417). The Examiner also rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claim 3 as being unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Houldsworth et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,754); claim 4 as being unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Houldsworth as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Dombrowski et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,275,167); claims 5 and 6 as being unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Houldsworth and further in view of Iyer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,593,768); claim 7 as being unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Houldsworth, as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Iyer; and claim 8 as being unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Houldsworth and Dombroski as applied to claim 4, and further in view of Iyer.

As recited in independent claim 1, the instant invention is directed to *inter alia*:

“ . . . the receiver or the receivers comprise a component defining a threshold voltage opposing the flow of the electric current through the cable such that an

interference voltage must be greater than this threshold voltage in order to be interpreted as information.” (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicant, Taguchi describes that a voltage terminal of a power supply can be maintained at a specified voltage V2 and be used as a reference voltage for one or more integrated circuits. Taguchi does not teach or suggest that the V2/VTT voltage, shown in Fig. 4, is a “threshold voltage” or that it “oppose[s] the flow of electric current through the cable.”

The Office Action, in relying on Taguchi, states that the electric current i_1 , powered by VTT, opposes the flow of electric current i_0 . However, the circuit cited in Taguchi operates differently and in fact uses a push-pull circuit, as described throughout the specification of Taguchi and in at least the first full paragraph of Col. 10. The push-pull circuit in Fig. 4 operates in two different modes depending on the input to transistors 49 and 50. These two different modes define two different closed circuits, and hence result in two different flows of current through the cable.

Accordingly, Taguchi does not teach or suggest an installation for exchanging information “such that an interference voltage must be greater than this threshold voltage in order to be interpreted as information” as supported throughout the specification of the instant invention and in at least paragraphs [0013, 0023, and 0031]. In addition to Taguchi being silent on the interference voltage being interpreted as information while it is greater than the threshold voltage, Applicant again respectfully points Examiner to the push-pull circuit of Fig. 4 and as described throughout the specification of Taguchi and in at least the first full paragraph of Col. 10.

Finally, Houldsworth, Dombrowski, and Iyer fail to cure the defects of Taguchi.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the relied upon portions of Taguchi, Houldsworth, Dombrowski, and Iyer.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent on an independent claim discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and an early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to
Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:


Ronald R. Santucci
Reg. No. 28,988
(212) 588-0800